

## "La Reforme" in Quebec Health and Social Services; Impact on Jewish Casework Services\*

SOLOMON M. BROWNSTEIN†

Assistant Executive Director, Jewish Family Service, New York

JEWISH Family Services (Baron de Hirsch Institute) of Montreal will shortly convene its 110th Annual Meeting. At this meeting four members of the Board will be elected to represent JFS on the ten member Conseil d'Administration of the new Jewish Family Services-Social Service Center, a public establishment organized and maintained in accordance with the 1971 Statutes of Quebec, Chapter 48, The Conseil will assume governance of the major portion of the agency's program on or about July 1, 1974. This major step is the outcome of a resolution approved by the JFS Board on January 8, 1974 to the effect that:

In view of the fact that practical considerations make it impossible for JFS to continue as a private agency, be it resolved that JFS assume the primary responsibility for organizing a public Jewish Social Service Center, subject to the guarantees of the resolution of the AJCS Board of Trustees; and that JFS continue to operate that part of its program which will not be insured or funded by the Department of Social Affairs.

It is the writer's intent in this paper to trace the etiology of this "forced marriage" between the public sector and private Jewish philanthropy. To his knowledge nowhere else in North America has government expansionism occurred so rapidly and so totally with such major impact on a Jewish community and its health and welfare institutions. One can

\* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, San Francisco, June 3, 1974.

† At the time this article was written Mr. Brownstein was Executive Director, Jewish Family Services, Montreal.

assume that the Montreal experience provides, in some measure, a preview of the coming "attractions" for other locales on this continent. Thus, in examining and analyzing this experience, we may be able to crystallize some of the issues and strategies which will constitute the future agendas of other communities.

Speaking before the Child Welfare League of America's Executive Conference in Chicago in 1972, Fred R. MacKinnon, Deputy Minister of Public Welfare for the Province of Nova Scotia, made the following statement concerning his fears about the increasing involvement of government in Canadian Social Welfare.

The primary problem relates to the vast concentration of power and the human capacity to cope with this. Because I am assuming that government will continue to grow bigger, the prospect of an increasing concentration of power in a single body gives me much concern. I am fearful lest government, as it becomes larger and more pervasive, exert a power and influence over individual lives that might destroy us. I, therefore, prefer a system of checks and balances, in which the primary check is on power. I see no hope of achieving this unless there are agencies in the community that have the funds, the community support and the courage to stand up and talk back effectively to big government, big business, big labor unions, big churches and the media.<sup>1</sup>

(In Quebec we are faced with special additional issues of Government control which relate to the technocratization and implementation by government of the French-Canadian nationalistic concept of "maître chez-nous" (masters in our own house).

<sup>1</sup> "Changing Patterns in Public-Voluntary Relationships in Canada," *Child Welfare*, Vol III, No. 10 (Dec. 1973).

For the Jewish social service agency to be trapped in the web of government expansionism in the health and social service sector creates dilemmas and issues that go far beyond those of government control cited above. Clearly the *raison d'être* for our agencies' survival as a system apart from government includes but transcends our identification with a goal of voluntarism in social agencies, i.e. to maintain the necessary balance in and check on governmental power.

The recent preoccupation in the Jewish field with the casework agency's Jewish survivalistic responsibility has resulted in a *special* additional commitment to maintaining organizational and structural forms which permit maximum autonomy in agency governance, programming, priority-setting and professional orientation. Sessions at meetings of this conference during the past ten years have grappled with the integration of the elusive, yet ever present, Jewish element into family and child welfare practice.<sup>2</sup> Each year the quest is resumed, and each year we progress further.

We are suggesting that:

- 1) There resides within each Jew the potentiality for increased Jewish identification and commitment, (and therefore that).
- 2) Passage (by the client) through a Jewish agency system must provide that

<sup>2</sup> See: a. Zeff, David & Greenberg, Irving, "The Jewish Casework Agency: Problems and Prospects in a Time of Paradox", this *Journal*, b. Aptekar, Herbert H., "The Role of the Jewish Service Agency in American Society" *NCJCS Washington, D.C., May 18, 1966*. c. Bernstein, Maurice, "The Unique Contribution of the Jewish Casework Agency to the Welfare of the Jewish Community", *NCJCS, Atlantic City, N.J., May 24, 1967*. d. Edelstein, Rosalind, "Jewish Identity Factors in Casework Practice" *NCJCS, Detroit, Michigan*, June 9, 1968. e. Zeff, David, "The Jewish Family Agency, The Jewish Federation and The United Fund: Problems, Omens and Opportunities" *NCJCS, New York N.Y. May 29, 1969*.

client with opportunities which attempt to engage and activate this potential.

Thus a recurrent requirement which emerges and re-emerges in each paper as a basic prerequisite if we are to successfully integrate the Jewish component, is that the agency system must be open, and free to experiment and innovate. Without this freedom, the Jewish family and child care agency is doomed, not only in terms of its loss of vitality, but also in terms of its isolation from the mainstream of contemporary Jewish life.

Consider as one among several examples, the challenging report of the Los Angeles agency's experience in developing distinctively Jewish programs, as presented to a meeting at this conference just one year ago.<sup>3</sup> As Ted Isenstadt described the process of "consciously building the Jewish component into the warp and woof of the agency" one was struck with the courage of the agency, as well as with the openness of the agency and community systems within which change was taking place. It is hardly necessary to state that were the agency a district office of a large bureaucratic government organization, such gut level change and innovation could hardly have occurred.

In further clarifying a frame of reference for examining the Montreal experience, we return to Mr. MacKinnon's basic assumption,<sup>4</sup> "I am assuming that government will continue to grow bigger." There is no question that this assumption is valid and its effects increasingly visible.

How, then, did Montreal respond? We first turn to the law, Chapter 48<sup>5</sup>, then examine the response to the law by the

<sup>3</sup> Isenstadt, Theodore, "Toward Enriching The Quality of Jewish Life: The Role of the Jewish Family and Children's Agency", this *Journal*, Vol. I, No. I (Fall, 1973), p. 51.

<sup>4</sup> See MacKinnon, Fred, *op. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> An Act Respecting Health Services and Social Services (Chapter 48 — 1971) (*Loi Sur Les Services de Santé et Les Services Sociaux*). *Quebec Official Publisher*, Feb. 1974. See also: a. Bernier, Pierre A.,

local Federation (Allied Jewish Community Services), and by the Agency (Jewish Family Services of the Baron de Hirsch Institute). Finally we will deal with the response of the Jewish communal worker.

### The Law

For the purpose of this article it is sufficient to note that it outlaws sectarianism in social service both in publicly and privately funded agencies, obliges government funding only to the public agency, and relegates agency governance to a small board of directors with limited decision-making powers. The control thus resides neatly and snugly within the Ministry of Social Affairs.

A review of the history and recent critique of the law provides more cogent insights into its impact than would be provided by reviewing the legislation, as enacted.

In 1967, the Premier of the Province of Quebec established the Commission of Enquiry into Health and Social Welfare, under the direction of Claude Castonguay. In 1970 the Castonguay Commission published its report<sup>6</sup>, and it immediately became evident as reported by one of my colleagues that:

The recommendations of the Commission promise to be more than informed rhetoric. The former Chairman of the Commission, Claude Castonguay, is Minister of Social Affairs. He seems clearly committed to the implementation of the main recommendations of the Commission's findings. The Ministry is energetically moving Quebec's health and social services in the direction of providing egalitarian

<sup>6</sup> "L'Orientation des Services Sociaux au Quebec" *Intervention*, No. 37, Spring 1972, p. 12. b. "The Social Service Center", (Working paper prepared by the Ministry of Social Affairs, Quebec, July 26, 1972).

<sup>6</sup> "Reports of the Commission of Inquiry Into Health and Social Welfare" Ministry of Social Affairs, Quebec 1970.

and integrated health and social services for citizens throughout the Province . . . embodied in Chapter 48 (Bill 65) An Act Respecting Health Services and Social Services . . . These plans cut across an existing network of health and social services which, for historical reasons, are unevenly and sometimes unfairly organized. Health and social services in Quebec have been marked by pockets of excellence, yet surrounded by areas of less developed services . . . the social work profession finds itself divided at this time in the life of the province. It is seen that Chapter 48 may have a different impact within the urban centres, than it will have in multi-cultural, pluralistic, non-Francophile community largely centred in Montreal. Uneasiness is felt by those who are concerned about risk to ethnicity, language, religion and citizen control over services . . . Others see danger to professional autonomy as a result of the much greater bureaucratic structures anticipated in order to manage the task vested in the Social Service Centre<sup>7</sup>.

Two professional Corporations, those of Psychologists and Social Workers observed that:

The structures (contemplated under the Act) are imposed by those at the top; they do not emanate from the population itself and do not express its unique aspects; they are oriented more to the idea of autocracy than toward that of popular participation. In short, the spirit of control and uniformity which pervades Bill 65 (Chapter 48) might bring with it alienation of people rather than the satisfaction of their needs.<sup>8</sup>

The specific dilemma for the Jewish community was expressed by a colleague in an address prepared for the Labor Zionist Movement in Montreal.

Existence of Jewish institutions and community groups are a direct response to the needs of Jewish people as a community in Diaspora to have available those institutions which protect,

<sup>7</sup> Leibovitch, Pearl, "The Politics of Practice — Quebec 1973" *The Social Worker*, Vol. 41, No. 2, Summer 1973, p. 160.

<sup>8</sup> Brief presented jointly by the Corporation of Professional Psychologists, and the Corporation of Professional Social Workers before the Standing Parliamentary Committee on Social Affairs of the National Assembly of Quebec, Nov. 1971.

adapt and serve Jewish priorities and Jewish needs. At this juncture of world history the problem is expressed in the polarity between universalism and particularism. Bill 65 (Chapter 48) does appeal to the social justice and universal aspects of liberal Judaism, but at the same time it threatens Jewish existence.<sup>9</sup>

Finally an editorial in the Montreal Gazette dated September 28, 1971 sums up the initial response as follows:

There is no argument with the basic premise of Mr. Castonguay that a more equitable system of dispensing health and welfare services is required. The issue here is the apparent conviction that before a new structure can be erected all that has existed before must be ruthlessly demolished. This is precisely what Bill 65 (Chapter 48) in its present form would do. Yet there is no evidence in either past experience or present requirements that such draconian measures are essential.

More than a fear of the unknown, the reactions reflected a fear of the known, i.e. the question of human and professional survival within a highly centralized structure, emanating from a Government which, following the October 1970 crisis, also clearly added to its agenda the obligation to preserve French language and cultural rights within the system.

As noted above, one finds little to quarrel with in relation to the intent of the law, i.e. equal access to quality health and social services by all citizens of the Province . . . but many questioned — at what price?

### Federation Response

At the time of the introduction of Bill 65, AJCS (Allied Jewish Community Services) consisted of 21 member agencies, of which one third (seven) were affected by new legislation. Six agencies provided health services, and one, JFS, provided social services. The seven

<sup>9</sup> Weiss, David, "Critique of Bill 65" (Address prepared for presentation to the Labor Zionist Movement, Montreal, P.Q., Oct. 27, 1971).

agencies relied heavily on Provincial government funding, and submitted to a variety of government controls. Each agency was involved in dual budgeting and planning processes, i.e. with government and Federation, and each had developed a modus operandi for dealing with this "schizophrenic" process. The government appeared to have some recognition of the existence of a "Jewish system" of health and social services. In the opinion of this writer the agency-government relationships were positive. Conflicts related primarily to funding needed expansion of services (as nursing home beds) and were resolved through negotiation with a variety of seats of power in the government hierarchy, usually with Federation involvement. Federation staff assisted in planning strategy and co-ordinating approaches to government, including the initial setting of priorities.

Most crucial was the fact that each of the agencies was governed by an autonomous Jewish communal Board which reflected the usual interlocking with Federation Board Leadership.

Federation early recognized the negative implications of the new legislation, that is, if it were in fact to be fully implemented. It appeared that Federation anticipated (and I might say quite logically) that its time-tested strategy of negotiation with government officials (both elected and appointed) would be employed in this instance, and in fact result in an "arrangement" whereby Jewish agencies would survive in a special category, despite the enactment and implementation of the new legislation.

In the early period (1971) the Social Legislation Committee of AJCS took the lead in preparing an outstanding brief<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Brief submitted by the Canadian Jewish Congress, Eastern Region and Allied Jewish Community Services of Montreal to the Standing Parliamentary Committee on Social Affairs of the National Assembly of Quebec, Oct. 1971.

for presentation before the Standing Parliamentary Committee of Social Affairs of the National Assembly of Quebec. The Federation Committee also provided the primary meeting ground for all of the affected agencies. At its meetings, in addition to preparing the brief, information was shared, strategies were developed. In addition, special agency concerns were discussed in joint (Agency-Federation) officers meetings. An air of optimism pervaded these early efforts.

The AJCS brief emphasized the need for the legislation to be redrafted in order to protect the concepts of "volunteerism" and "cultural distinctiveness". In the latter area, the brief asserts, "Since we view health and social services as an intrinsic part of the culture of a people, we believe that each community has the right to protect, preserve and pursue its culture. Government has the responsibility to ensure that right." The brief went on to request that the concept of a "Community Institution be enshrined in the Act, i.e., a non-profit institution organized by a voluntary group, from which it derives continuing support, and operated as a Corporation within the meaning of the Civil Code, having no object but to maintain an institution fulfilling a function similar to a public institution and so recognized by the Minister."

Subsequent to the presentation of the brief in November, 1971, Federation pursued negotiations with government at various levels in order to reinforce the intent of the Brief. Although the second and final readings of the Bill (enacted December 24, 1972) reflected none of our requested changes, it was still expected that, in the final analysis, negotiation of an "arrangement" would be possible.

Witness an issue of *Your Community News* dated September 7, 1972 and devoted exclusively to Chapter 48. Head-

line: "Bourassa Assures Jewish Community No Substantial Changes in Operations of Agencies". The lead article goes on to describe a meeting between key Jewish community leaders and the Premier of the Province where the emphasis was on the "government's disinclination to upset what is already working well."

It is difficult to establish the exact point at which this seeming "love-in" went sour; however, AJCS and JFS leadership concurrently recognized that government's intent was to enact fully the legislation with little regard to the preservation of volunteerism and cultural distinctiveness as accepted and practiced heretofore in the Province. (Since this article is concerned with the JFS we will not pursue how this recognition was responded to by AJCS and the six health agencies.) Although JFS and AJCS agreed in their *perception* of government intent, the agencies differed as to the appropriate response. This difference of opinion became crystallized around the issue of JFS "going public" (fully entering the system) or "remaining private" (partially entering the system). The private route would permit the agency to retain its own Board, however, intake would need to be non-sectarian, and government funding would be drastically reduced.

The resolution of this difference required the major attention of both agencies for the better part of a year. The major forum for negotiation was the Joint Officers Group of both agencies. Federation did not deny the agency's basic reservations, nor the distinct possibility that by entering the system, the Jewish character of the agency would be lost. However, Federation did feel that living within the system must, nevertheless, be attempted, closely monitored by both groups, and if it did not work out then Federation would support the reorganization of a new agency outside

of the system. A resolution to the effect that JFS become a public social service center was approved by the AJCS Board of Trustees in November 1973. The Resolution reads in part,

AJCS shares with JFS completely the necessity of maintaining and, if possible, enhancing the essential social services to the people of the Jewish community who are in need of same, and anticipate that this can be achieved by JFS as a Public CSS, with supplementary budget provided by AJCS to JFS as required. AJCS Board of Trustees has urged JFS to take advantage of the opportunity now offered to it by Government to become a Public CSS, which offer may not be available in the future. *AJCS takes the position that it will not support JFS financially as a private CSS at the present time.* (emphasis added)

Under these latter conditions, JFS Board approved the conversion to a public CSS in January, 1974.

Federation, in the writer's estimation, acted responsibly as it perceived the facts. We exist in Quebec as an ethnic, religious and language minority. Federation in the last analysis must view the total community in terms of its needs, its resources and its vulnerability. A Federation leader agonizingly expressed his fear of "retaliation" (by Government) should JFS turn its back partially or totally on the new system. Although this writer is not a Quebecer, he can sympathize with that viewpoint, on one level. However, as an agency administrator he must also identify it as a characteristic adaptive response to dealing with power and authority which closes off the opportunity for lay leadership to consider any radical or confronting interventions.

#### Agency Response

JFS also early recognized the potential danger of Chapter 48 (Bill 65) but like Federation tended to hope that reliance on our previously successful strategy of negotiation with government would re-

sult in the preservation of the Jewish agency. Our brief to government presented in November, 1971 underlines the concepts of volunteerism and ethnic particularism as critical cornerstones in Jewish social welfare. We noted that:

The agency's program provides contemporary meaning to the traditional Jewish concepts of charity, loving kindness, and responsibility for one's fellow man . . . These traditional concepts have impelled and compelled Jewish communities throughout the free world to create and maintain social service agencies. Our agencies, although sectarian in character have contributed heavily to the welfare of the total community . . . Such issues as understanding of Jewish cultural factors, ability to facilitate communication between agencies in the Jewish community on behalf of clients, feelings of familiarity and trust, concern with the intricacies of traditional Jewish family life, etc., are imperative in facilitating the helping process with Jewish clients.<sup>11</sup>

As stated earlier in this paper, our strategies were not successful in deterring the thrust of government expansionism, as it related to our agency. By early 1973 our Board recognized that they were faced with a major dilemma. Close examination of such factors as (1) government's repudiation of former positions, (2) the intractability and inflexibility of MSA fonctionnaires responsible for implementing the Act, (3) the design of the Regulations issued to implement the Act resulted in the conclusion that opting into Bill 65 (Chapter 48) would result in significant and basic changes in the organization and structure of the agency. It was further recognized that the new structure, although appropriate in relation to the organizational objectives of the new legislation, was totally incongruent with the stated organizational objectives of the Jewish agency. We projected that the con-

<sup>11</sup> Brief submitted by the Baron de Hirsch Institute and Jewish Child Welfare Bureau to the Standing Parliamentary Committee on Social Affairs of the National Assembly of Quebec, Oct. 1971.

straints imposed, were we to attempt to operate within the system, could immobilize the agency. The Board therefore instructed the Officers to pursue the course of operating as a private establishment, frankly as the lesser of two evils.

As stated above this conclusion was contrary to the conclusion reached by the Federation Board, upon examination of the same facts. The forum selected for negotiating a resolution to these differences was the Joint Officers' Group of both agencies. Each group reported back to its respective Boards and staffs. For the agency this meant that during the course of negotiations we assumed a low profile in interpreting the issues as we saw them to the broader community, or in publicly seeking support of our position.

Federation Board on the other hand provided Federation with a much broader public, and potential for support. Although the agency was always afforded equal time to explain its position at Federation board meetings, these remained, in the last analysis, Federation meetings.

In June, 1973, the Ministry of Social Affairs, without notice, discontinued its funding of JFS. This action was obviously taken in response to the agency's expressed intention to delay opting into the system. In this writer's opinion the impact of this action on Federation Board was to close off their willingness to listen further to the agency's concerns. We were now talking money, not principle. Leaders of other constituent agencies felt threatened that increased allocations to JFS, in order to compensate for the loss of government funds, would affect their own budgets. It was in this climate that the aforementioned Resolution was approved by the AJCS Board of Trustees in November, 1973.

Following this action, there remained little recourse for the agency. We consid-

ered the possibility of closing up shop, or withdrawing from Federation and raising our own funds, and finally settled upon the decision to operate two agencies. (Federation had declared its intention to organize and operate a public social service center if JFS did not exercise this option). The pre-existing agency operated a small number of programs which were never funded by government, nor covered by the Act and therefore never susceptible to Chapter 48. The Board assumes the watchdog role over the social service center, and acts as the conduit for any Jewish community supplementary funding of the social service center programmes. The new agency assumes the responsibility for administering the major portion of the previously existing agency program, within the constraints of government regulations. (Continuation of the two agency system is in no way guaranteed. It contains the seeds of possible confrontation with Government or with other ethnic groups.)

As of this writing the agency is five months within the system. To the writer's mind it is obvious that we are no longer masters in our own house, but rather preoccupied with employing defensive postures in order to maintain what we have, against the incursions of one government directive or another. The challenges to Jewish agency survival from within and without the system are numerous. As an example, we are now struggling with the implementation of a Government directive which requires the discontinuation of fee charging for all agency services. We are particularly concerned about the impact of this policy on the readiness of middle-class clients to use our services. The ingenuity required to survive is formidable. During negotiations with Federation it was suggested that we would all need to learn how to swim underwater . . . wet suits and snorkels have become the costume of the day.

### Jewish Communal Worker Response

Since this report is being made to a Conference of Jewish communal workers, any examination of the impact of government expansionism, Federation and agency response, must include some comments on the dilemma that these events present to the Jewish communal worker, and thus to his response.

Each of us assumes responsibilities in a particular agency and community after examining the organizational objectives of the agency, the task performance required in order to facilitate the achievement of these objectives (hopefully in relation to our own assessment of our professional competencies), and finally the communal political and financial constraints and supports which will impede or assist us. Our contract with an agency is based on a mutual agreement that we can do the job required.

Jewish agency executives are increasingly being drawn to agencies and communities which are prepared to support programming related to the improvement of the quality of Jewish life. Under the best of circumstances this objective suggests protean tasks and requires the development of new concepts, new skills, and new approaches to our daily work. As suggested earlier in this paper, autonomy and freedom are basic requirements for the organization pursuing Jewish objectives.

Enter the reality of government expansionism and control in the health and social service areas. It would be folly to suggest that government is anti-ethnic, or anti-cultural in their conceptualization of effective service delivery systems. Based on the Quebec experience, government is more *a-ethnic* and *a-cultural*. In other words, they just don't see, or can't afford to see, the connection. Perhaps the system of bureaucratic morality which suggests equal access and equal opportunity is in itself a means to justify control.

How do we respond to this constraint? Martha Selig suggests a positive (and unequivocal) Jewish stance for Federation in the area of government relations<sup>12</sup>. The writer heartily endorses this concept. (Selig's paper served our community well up to a point.) What "bag of tricks" do we as Jewish communal workers utilize when the "positive Jewish stance" does not result in appropriate returns, i.e. when we are faced with a legally enforced system reduction?

Consider the following three courses of action:

1) To maintain our objectives, and see the relationship with government as an additional constraint-challenge to be dealt with.

2) To alter our objectives, recognizing that Jews will be served by quasi-public systems, but not in a Jewish way. The improvement of the quality of Jewish life then becomes the responsibility of other sectors of the organized Jewish community.

3) To confront government's a-ethnicity through thoughtful political and social action geared to protecting our acquired rights as a minority group of taxpayers within a pluralistic society.

The task of implementing a decision to pursue any of these alternatives presents the Jewish communal worker with enormous professional dilemmas.

The first is certain to result in a professional "squeeze play" wherein the daily struggle for survival contaminates one's ability to provide sound professional leadership in relation to the agency's objectives.

The second appears to be a "cop out" and suggests severe questioning of the Jewish role of all Jewish communal agencies, with the exception of those providing educational or cultural services. This also suggests that the educa-

<sup>12</sup> Selig, Martha K., "New Dimensions in Government Funding of Voluntary Agencies: Potentials and Risks," this *Journal*, Vol. L, No. 2 (Winter 1973), p. 125.

tional and cultural agencies are alone equal to the task of ensuring the improvement of the quality of Jewish life.

The third alternative requires first, a high level of determination to survive, second, a new level of maturity and cohesiveness in Jewish communal life, and third, a commitment to democratization of our institutions and processes which would permit a renewed collaboration with Jewish masses.

Where then, does all of this leave the Jewish communal worker? Are we up to the challenge, or are we in fact bankrupt, bereft of the professional skill required to lead our agencies in an era of government expansionism, particularly when the external dangers are coupled with internal dangers, i.e. the fear of our communities to confront the price of survival.

My own experience during the past three years suggests that we are bankrupt if in response to the anxiety engendered by the immobilizing forces of government bureaucracy, and community fear and ambivalence we revert to denial (the problem really isn't that serious), or regression (let's revert to the use of responses that we know and are comfortable with). We will survive and flourish as a field only if we have the courage to recognize now that our concepts and our tools are inadequate to meet this new threat to agency life and perhaps, in the last analysis, to Jewish life. The messianic defensive know-it-all ego trip of self-styled leaders, no matter how gratifying, is over. The real work must now begin.

What concepts and tools are available to counteract the assault and decrease the feeling of impotency? Why the gap

between what we feel and what we do? Are we accurate in our perception of where the client (community) is or do we blindly prefer to see the client (community) as being where we are?

This first examination of the Montreal experience raises more questions than it provides answers. Before the inevitable wound had begun to heal, our community was faced with the impact of government expansionism on the character and language of Jewish Day School education, and the beginning rumble of government interest in recreational and camping services — and thus the pervasive government thrust continues.

"Against Despair" was the title of Elie Weisel's address at the first annual Lewis A. Pincus Memorial Lecture, December 1973. Weisel reflects on Jewish survival as follows:

Our existence in the Diaspora is a mystery, as is the emergence of Israel. How do we survive, and why is our survival constantly threatened? *To me, the essence of Jewish history is mystical and not rational.* From the strictly rational viewpoint, we should have long ago yielded to the pressures and laws of the enemy and agreed to leave the stage gracefully, if not voluntarily — as other ancient civilizations have done. *The mystery of our survival is matched only by our will to survive* in a society embarrassed and annoyed by our presence — and to a degree, understandably so.

Has the process of professionalization transformed us into a breed of despairingly rational men? I believe that it has. The improvement of the quality of Jewish life, and thus the survival of Jewish life in the Diaspora will occur only if we recognize that the work must begin by our recapturing and rebuilding our own will to survive.